



VISION JOURNAL

<http://jurnaltarbiyah.uinsu.ac.id/>



THE CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN MALAYSIAN TELEVISION SERIES '*UPIN AND IPIN*' EPISODE 5

Rizky Yolanda

STKIP Insan Madani Air Molek

Keywords	Abstract
<i>Keywords: Conversational Implicatures, Utterances, Malaysian Television Series</i>	Upin and Ipin is a Malaysian television series of animated short produced by Les' Copaque Production Sdn. Bhd, which features the life and adventures of the eponymous twin brothers in a fictional Malaysian kampong. This paper is a pragmatics study that aims an investigating conversational implicature in Malaysian television series ' <i>Upin and Ipin</i> ', mainly used H.P Grice's theory of conversational implicature. The episodes 5 has chosen as the sample in this study. The writer has found that the implicature occurred for 66 times of 113 utterances. This study used qualitative method as the methodology. Based on the Grice's theory of conversational implicature, implicatures arise from interaction of the following three factors (1) The proposition actually expressed in the utterance, (2) Possibly certain features of the context, and (3) The assumption that the speaker is obeying the rules of conversation to the best of their ability. This study conclude that various types of implicatures were used in Malaysian television series ' <i>Upin and Ipin</i> ' episode 5.

Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, 1st Floor
Jalan Willem Iskandar Psr V Medan, 20731
Telp. 061- 6622925 – Fax. 061 – 6615685

INTRODUCTION

Implicature denotes either the act of meaning or implying one thing by saying something else, or the object of that act. Implicature can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional context. Implicature serves a variety of goals beyond communication: maintaining good social relations, misleading without lying, style and verbal efficiency. Knowledge of

common forms of implicature is acquired along with one's native language at an early age. H.P. Grice (1981), who coined the term 'implicature' and classified the phenomenon developed and influential theory to explain and predict conversational implicatures and describe how they arise and are understood. The Cooperative Principle and associated maxims play a central role.

As Grice (1975) states, speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation. In communication, participants are required to say the truth, be relevant and try to be as clear as possible (Yule, 1996). For this reason, Grice (1981) formulates a general "Cooperative Principle" which is elaborated in four sub-principles called maxims. This principle can be briefly described as "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged"(Grice, 1989).

Within this principle, he suggests four maxims: quality, quantity, relevance and manner. Quality maxim deals with the truthfulness of the given information, quantity maxim with the definite amount of required information given by the speaker, and relevance maxim with the relevancy of information that the speaker contributes especially in relation to the ongoing context. Manner maxim deals with the way how participants convey their message clearly and execute their performance with reasonable dispatch. The theory is designed to explain and predict the interpretation of a conversational implicature.

According to Grice, there are some kinds of implicature, they are conversational and conventional implicature. Conversational Implicature is briefly characterized as propositions or assumptions not encoded, completely or incompletely in what is actually said. Conversational implicatures are typically connected to what is said rather than the way it is said. Conversational implicature deals with Gricean maxims. It follows Grice's cooperative principle. For example, someone who says, "I bring a pencil" whereas she is asked to bring a pencil and a marker can be concluded as cooperating and following the quantity maxim since she does not mention the item that was not brought. It can be said that the speaker has conveyed more than he said via conversational implicature, while hearer recognizes the meaning via inference. This is in line with Grice (1975) who defines implicature for the case in which what speaker means or implies is different from what is said.

Grice (Levinson, 1983) divides conversational implicature into two kinds. In contrast to generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature is strongly tied to the particular features of the context. In this specific context, locally recognized inferences are assumed (Yule 1996 p.42). Generally, this conversational implicature will lead to the violation of Gricean's maxims. Generalized conversational implicatures is one which does not depend on particular features of the context, but is instead typically associated with the proposition expressed then a particularized conversational implicature occurs when a conversation takes place in a very specific context in which locally recognized inferences are assumed.

The example of generalized and particularized conversational implicature:

A: What time is it?

B: Some of the guests are already leaving.

Particularized : It must be late.

Generalized : Not all of the guests are already leaving.

A: Where's John?

B: Some of the guests are already leaving.

Particularized : Perhaps John is already leaving.

Generalized : Not all of the guests are already leaving.

According to Grice, the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said (Grice 1975). Conventional implicature works with specific words and results in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used (Yule 1996). It is not related with cooperative principle and not tied to the context in which they occur for the interpretation. Conjunctions are the specific words that Yule means in his description. Some examples of the conjunctions are *and*, *so*, *but*, *therefore*, and *however*. Conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. It is the name given to non-truth conditional aspects of meaning which are “conventionally” attached to particular linguistic forms.

The example of conventional implicatures:

He is an English man, therefore he is brave.

Conversational implicature is a great subject for pragmatics study. Because, it involves our real life conversations to be studied and analyzed. Conversational implicatures means “a secret” behind our conversation. Grice has offered simple principle in implicatures that can we use to solve that “secret”. Through this study we will understand what the conversational implicatures is, and learn how to use and see implicatures in conversations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used qualitative method by presencing of a simple statistical data for describing the occurrences of the intended features. The data were taken from one episode Malaysian television series ‘*Upin and Ipin*’ episode 5 with approximately 9 minutes 14 seconds of airing time. Malaysian television series ‘*Upin and Ipin*’ was originally released on September 13 2007 on TV9 channel Malaysia as six episode Ramadhan/Eid special, to instill significance of the islamic holy month amongst children. But, in Indonesia this series is broadcasted on MNCTV three times a day, at 08.00 am, 12.00 pm and 05.00 pm. In order to make the data analyzable, the episode selected was firstly recorded to avoid many practical difficulties of data collection (Wray *et.al.* 1998). The audio data were recorded and transformed into 714 words of transcription. After the researchers carefully read the transcripts, the utterances of the presenters and the other participants were distinctively identified based on conversational implicature framework proposed by Grice (1975). Every utterance containing implicature is taken out from the transcripts and numbered. To facilitate the analysis, every word or phrase in which the implicature lies is underlined and examined.

The findings show that in episode 5 of *Upin and Ipin* taken as a sample of this study, implicature occurs in the show 66 times of 113 utterances. The occurrences are divided into four categories. The writer classified the conversational implicature based on the characteristics of the conversational implicature it selves. According to Grice, there are four characteristics of conversational implicature, Cancellability/ Defeasibility, Non-detachability/ Non conventionality, Calculability and Implicature Changes.

- a. Cancellability means the implicature can be cancelled or defeasibility. Conversational implicature can be cancelled by additional material without contradiction or anomaly (irregularity).
- b. Non-detachability means the implicature is not separable.the same propositional content in the same context will always give rise to the same conversational implicature, in whatever form it is expressed. The implicature is tied to the meaning and not to the form.
- c. Calculability means conversational implicature must be calculable, using stateable general principle on the basis of conventional meaning together with contextual information.
- d. Implicatures changes means the same words carry different implicatures on different occasions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Percentage of Conversational Implicatures

Kinds of Conversational Implicature	Number of Data	Percentage
Cancellability	13 data	19.7%
Calculability	32 data	48.5%
Non-detachable	4 data	6 %
Calculability	17	25.8 %
Total	66	100 %

The occurrences of conversational implicature based on cancellability occur 13 times or about 19.7% of the whole conversational implicatures that the whole characters use in their utterances during the episode 5 Malaysian television series 'Upin and Ipin'.

Upin : Mule2 memang lah susah (At first, it was hard)

Ipin : Tapi tibe2 je dah nak raye (but before we know it, it was near with Hari Raya)

Upin : Ha, kejam je puase (Fasting seemed so enjoyable)

In expression Ha, kejam je puase (Fasting seemed so enjoyable) implies that Upin wanted to cancel and clarify his utterance about fasting is hard by giving additional information of his previous utterance.

Ipin : Tapi kan opah, kawan ipin kan, die puase setengah hari je, boleh ke opah? (My friend said that he only needs to fast half a day, can we Opah?)

Opah : Memang boleh, Tapi budak baik kene puase penuh, kan lagi bagus, dapat banyak pahale, boleh masuk surge kan (Of course you can, but isn't it better to be a good boy and fast a whole day, you will get more good deeds, and you get to go to heaven)

In expression Memang boleh, Tapi budak baik kene puase penuh, kan lagi bagus, dapat banyak pahale, boleh masuk surge kan (Of course you can, but isn't it better to be a good boy and fast a whole day, you will get more good deeds, and you get to go to heaven) implies that Opah wanted to clarify his

utterance “memang boleh (Of course you can)” by giving additional information of her previous utterance.

The occurrences of conversational implicature based on implicature change occur 32 times or about 48.5% of the whole conversational implicatures that the whole characters use in their utterances during the episode 5 Malaysian television series ‘*Upin and Ipin*’.

Fizi : Mulai hari esok, aku nak puase penuh. (Starting tomorrow, I want to fast the whole day)

Ehsan : *Tapi, esok mungkin raye. (But, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri)*

In expression *Tapi, esok mungkin raye. (But, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri)* implies that Ehsan means Fizi has too late to start fasting the whole day. This utterance can change the implicature of meaning if it is uttered in different occasion.

Rajoo : Ye lah, sudah lapa ni, boleh makan sekarang tak? (Yeah, I’m hungry. Can we eat now?)

Upin : *Kak Ros belum panggil lagi. (Kak Ros haven’t calles us in yet)*

In expression *Kak Ros belum panggil lagi. (Kak Ros haven’t calles us in yet)* implies that Upin means they can’t in to eat because Kak Ros still preparing the meals. This utterance can change the implicature of meaning if it is uttered in different occasion.

The occurrences of conversational implicature based on Non Detachable occur 4 times or about 6% of the whole conversational implicatures that the whole characters use in their utterances during the episode 5 Malaysian television series ‘*Upin and Ipin*’.

Kak Ros : *Opah, esok mungkin raye. (Opah, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri)*

The utterance *Opah, esok mungkin raye. (Opah, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri)* means kak Ros wants to inform Opah if today is the last fasting and let us get ready for all Hari Raya’s preparations.

Upin : *Kite ni budak baik lah opah. (We’re good boys Opah)*

By saying this utterance, Upin wants to imply they can fast a whole day, and they’ll get to go to heaven.

The occurrences of conversational implicature based on implicature change occur 17 times or about 25.8% of the whole conversational implicatures that the whole characters use in their utterances during the episode 5 Malaysian television series ‘*Upin and Ipin*’.

Kak Ros : Opah, esok mungkin raye. (Opah, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri)

Opah : Iye ke? kalau begitu opah rase elok kalau kite mule masak ketupat sekarang. (Really? Then I guess we should start preparing the ketupat for tomorrow)

The utterance Iye ke? kalau begitu opah rase elok kalau kite mule masak ketupat sekarang. (Really? Then I guess we should start preparing the ketupat for tomorrow) is the calculable utterance, because by Kak Ros' utterance Opah, esok mungkin raye. (Opah, tomorrow might be Aidilfitri) Opah's response or expression has been calculated because conversational implicature must be calculable, using stateable general principle on the basis of conventional meaning together with contextual information.

Kak Ros : Korang nak makan ayam? (Do you want chicken?)

Upin and Ipin : Nak nak (Yes, I do)

The utterance Nak nak (Yes, I do) is the calculable utterance, because by Kak Ros' utterance Korang nak makan ayam? (Do you want chicken?) Upin and Ipin's response or expression has been calculated because they really like chicken, it means surely they have answered Nak nak (Yes, I do).

IV. CONCLUSION

After analysing the data, the writer conclude that there are many conversational implicature that occur in Malaysian television series 'Upin and Ipin' episode 5. The conversational implicature takes place in the context of communication and the context of this movie. The result of this study may just reflect a part of the conversational implicature that the characters apply in the show but it perhaps will give more references and further considerations for language students in their studies and even broadcasters within their communications. A broader scope and more varied samples related to this investigation are highly recommended in order to confirm these findings and to explore more possible theories.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Sage Publication.
- Bassnett, S. 1991. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Bell, R. T. 1991. *Translation and Translating*. Newyork: Longman.

- Bosseaux, C. 2007. *How Does it Feel? Point of View in Translation*. Amsterdam: Rodopi BV.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rustono. 1998. Implikatur *Percakapan sebagai Penunjang Pengungkapan Humor didalam Wacana Humor Verbal Lisan Berbahasa Indonesia*. Unpublishe Doctoral Dissertation, FIB-UI.
- Yule, G. (1996) *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.